



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,173	06/01/2001	Henri Daniel Schnurmann	YOR920010427US1	2988
49267	7590	06/06/2006	EXAMINER	
KEUSEY, TUTUNJIAN & BITETTO, P.C. 20 CROSSWAYS PARK NORTH, SUITE 210 WOOBURY, NY 11797			VAN DOREN, BETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/873,173	SCHNURMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Beth Van Doren	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,10-18,22-31 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7,10-18,22-31 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a non-final office action in response to communications received 03/30/06. Claims 1-4, 10, 12-15, 22, and 25-31 have been amended. Claims 1-7, 10-18, 22-31, and 34 are now pending in this office action.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment to claim 12 is sufficient to overcome the claim objections set forth in the previous office action.

3. Applicant's amendment to claims 3, 13, 15, 22, 25, 30, and 31 are sufficient to overcome the 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, rejections set forth in the previous office action.

4. Examiner notes that claim 34 was listed in error as being rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, this rejection has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, see pages 11-14, filed 03/30/06, with respect to the language precise terrestrial coordinates corresponding to a postal address have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous rejections have been withdrawn. However, new art rejections are established below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3623

7. Claims 1-7, 14-18, 22-24, 26-31, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peapod.com in view of Fitch et al. (U.S. 6,321,092). Peapod.com is disclosed in the following references:

- i. Screenshots of www.peapod.com retrieved via the Wayback Machine, www.archive.org, and dated 11/13/1996 (referred to herein as reference A);
- ii. Article by Walsh entitled "Survey-Mastering Information Management" from Financial Times, dated 03/15/1999 (referred to herein as reference B).

As per claim 1, Peapod.com teaches a method for providing a service, comprising the steps of:

cross-referencing a postal address of each client from a plurality of clients to a geographic location for each of said clients (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 5, section 2, page 6, and reference B, page 2, section 1, wherein the postal address (i.e. zip location) of the client is cross-referenced to a service area (geographic location));

obtaining information relative to an individualized service to be provided to at least one of said plurality of clients (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 5, section 1, and page 10, and reference B, page 2, section 1, wherein information is obtained related to the delivery service wanted by at least one client); and

providing said individualized service to said at least one of said clients based on said cross-referencing and said information (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 6, and page 10, wherein delivery is provided to at least one client based on the client's zip code being within a geographic area).

However, Peapod.com does not expressly disclose precise terrestrial coordinates corresponding to said postal address being cross referenced to the postal address.

Fitch et al. discloses precise terrestrial coordinates corresponding to a postal address (See column 6, lines 15-35, column 12, lines 50-65).

Both Fitch et al. and Peapod.com disclose location-based service using information about the person's home location. Peapod.com discloses providing a person home delivery service on items such as those from the grocery or drugstore. Fitch et al. discloses correlating coordinate information and street addresses to provide services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide delivery service based on terrestrial coordinates in order to more efficiently provide services to a person's home by precisely identifying the location. See reference A, page 2, section 3, and page 3, section 1, and column 6, lines 15-35, column 12, lines 50-65, of Fitch et al., both emphasizing the speed of delivery of service. Peapod.com also discusses the ease of having deliveries come to the home in reference A, page 2, sections 2-3, page 5, section 1.

As per claim 2-4, Peapod.com discloses storing in a database information concerning the client and also storing information that allows a client to cross-reference a postal address and a geographic location (See reference A, page 6, and reference B, page 2, section 1). Further, Peapod.com discloses:

as per claim 2, stored information regarding a postal address and a geographic location (See reference A, page 6, and reference B, page 2, section 1) and using a data base having said information relative to said individualized service to be delivered to each of said plurality of clients (See reference A, page 2, section 3, and reference B, page 2, section 1).

Art Unit: 3623

as per claim 3, wherein said database includes information selected from the group that includes service requirements (See reference A, page 2, section 3, and reference B, page 2, section 1);

as per claim 4, a postal address and a geographic location for each of said clients and information relative to said individualized service to be delivered to each of said plurality of clients are stored by the system (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 6, and reference B, page 2, section 1).

However, while Peapod.com and Fitch et al. discloses the use of data storage and databases, neither Peapod.com nor Fitch et al. expressly discloses a first and a second database versus one common database.

Both Fitch et al. and Peapod.com disclose location-based service using information about the person's home location, wherein the computer system includes the use of data storage and databases. It is well known in the database arts to use a first and a second database versus one common database in order to increase the efficiency of the database, such as increasing the speed of access time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the data storage and database of Peapod.com using two separate databases in order to increase the access efficiency in retrieving data by decreasing time based on the use of multiple databases. Examiner points out that the use of a single database of two databases storing the claimed data has no functional significance in the claim limitations.

As per claim 5, Peapod.com discloses ascertaining the status of the delivery of said service (See page 2, section 3, and page 5, section 1, wherein the status of the delivery (what day, what time window) is ascertained by the system.

As per claim 6, Peapod.com discloses setting a window for completion and delivery of 30 minutes or 90 minutes (See reference A, page 2, section 3). However, neither Peapod.com nor Fitch et al. expressly discloses notifying said at least one client about this completion.

Both Fitch et al. and Peapod.com disclose home services based on location information. Peapod.com discloses delivering home services based on information input into an interface at the person's home location, the home service associated with a fee. Peapod.com further discloses setting a window for completion and a delivery time of 30 minutes or 90 minutes. It is well known in the service industry that notifying a user of fees charged after completion as well as a completion window indicates intent to complete the service and that the goods being delivered to the house would also be considered notifying the client. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to notify a user of completion of a service (via a charge) in order to accurately maintain records associated with services performed for the user.

As per claim 7, Peapod.com discloses setting a window for completion and delivery of 30 minutes or 90 minutes, and thus discloses notifying said at least one client of a planned delivery of said service (See reference A, page 2, section 3).

Claim 14 recites substantially similar limitations to claims 1 and 2 above and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claims 15, 16, 17, and 18 are substantially similar to claims 3, 5, 6, and 7, respectively, and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 22, Peapod.com teaches a system for delivering at least one postal service to at least one service requester from a plurality of service requesters, each service requester being at a known postal address, the system comprising:

a cross-referencing module for cross-referencing said known postal address to a geographic location, forming a cross-referenced location for said at least one service requester (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 5, section 2, page 6, and reference B, page 2, section 1, wherein the postal address (i.e. zip location) of the client is cross-referenced to a service area (geographic location) and is stored by the website/software);

a database for storing information pertaining said at least one postal service applicable to each of said plurality of service requesters to be delivered at said known postal address (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 5, section 1, and page 10, and reference B, page 2, section 1, wherein information is obtained related to the delivery service wanted by at least one client, the information stored in the system); and

a service provider module for providing said service based on said selected information retrieved from said database at said cross-referenced location (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 6, and page 10, wherein delivery is provided to at least one client based on the client's postal information).

However, Peapod.com does not expressly disclose that the geographic location is associated with terrestrial coordinates precisely corresponding to said postal address.

Fitch et al. discloses precise terrestrial coordinates corresponding to a postal address (See column 6, lines 15-35, column 12, lines 50-65).

Both Fitch et al. and Peapod.com disclose location-based service using information about the person's home location. Peapod.com discloses providing a person home delivery service on items such as those from the grocery or drugstore. Fitch et al. discloses correlating coordinate information and street addresses to provide services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide delivery service based on terrestrial coordinates in order to more efficiently provide services to a person's home by precisely identifying the location. See reference A, page 2, section 3, and page 3, section 1, and column 6, lines 15-35, column 12, lines 50-65, of Fitch et al., both emphasizing the speed of delivery of service. Peapod.com also discusses the ease of having deliveries come to the home in reference A, page 2, sections 2-3, page 5, section 1.

As per claims 23 and 24, Peapod.com teaches a service requester that requests home delivery service (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 6, and page 10, wherein delivery is requested by a service requester). However, neither Peapod.com nor Fitch et al. expressly disclose that at least one service requester is a handicapped person, where the handicapped person is immobilized.

Both Fitch et al. and Peapod.com disclose location-based service using information about the person's home location. Examiner points out that the use of the system with regards to handicapped persons is an intended field of use, since the fact that the client is handicapped has no bearing on the functionality of the claim. Peapod.com discloses providing a person home delivery service on items such as those from the grocery or drugstore. It is well known in the art that home delivery services are necessary for some users, such as users with severe handicaps. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 3623

invention to provide delivery service to a person with a handicap in order to more efficiently meet the needs of handicapped users in a timely and efficient manner. Peapod.com discusses the ease of home deliveries in reference A, page 2, sections 2-3, page 5, section 1.

Claims 26 and 27 are both substantially similar to claim 1 and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above. Examiner further points out that Peapod.com is disclosed as a computer readable medium and a computer program product (See reference A, page 4).

As per claim 28, Peapod.com teaches a business method comprising the steps of:

having a business provide a plurality of services to a plurality of clients (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 6, and page 10, wherein a plurality of delivery services (grocery, drugstore, 30 minute deliveries, 90 minute deliveries, etc.) are provided to at least one client based on the client's postal information);

cross-referencing a postal address of each client from said plurality of clients to a geographical location corresponding to said postal address (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 5, section 2, page 6, and reference B, page 2, section 1, wherein the postal address (i.e. zip location) of the client is cross-referenced to a service area (geographic location));

obtaining information relative to an individualized service to be provided to at least one client from said plurality of clients (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 5, section 1, and page 10, and reference B, page 2, section 1, wherein information is obtained related to the delivery service wanted by at least one client); and

providing said individualized service to said at least one client based on said geographical location and said information (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 6, and page 10, wherein service is provided).

However, Peapod.com does not expressly disclose precise terrestrial coordinates corresponding to said postal address being cross referenced to the postal address.

Fitch et al. discloses precise terrestrial coordinates corresponding to a postal address (See column 6, lines 15-35, column 12, lines 50-65).

Both Fitch et al. and Peapod.com disclose location-based service using information about the person's home location. Peapod.com discloses providing a person home delivery service on items such as those from the grocery or drugstore. Fitch et al. discloses correlating coordinate information and street addresses to provide services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide delivery service to a person with a handicap in order to more efficiently provide services to a person's home by precisely identifying the location. See reference A, page 2, section 3, and page 3, section 1, and column 6, lines 15-35, column 12, lines 50-65, of Fitch et al., both emphasizing the speed of delivery of service. Peapod.com also discusses the ease of having deliveries come to the home in reference A, page 2, sections 2-3, page 5, section 1.

Claim 29 is substantially similar to claim 2 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Claim 30 is substantially similar to claim 3 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

Art Unit: 3623

As per claim 31, Peapod.com discloses wherein said client is a business and said service is selected from the group of services including: providing quick purchasing (See page 7 and page 10, which discuss commercial delivery).

Claim 34 is substantially similar to claim 28 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above. Peapod.com further disclose computer readable code means implemented in a computer medium (See reference A, page 4, and reference B, page 2, section 1)

8. Claims 10-13 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peapod.com in view of Fitch et al. (U.S. 6,321,092) and in further view of Behnke (U.S. 4,360,875). Peapod.com is disclosed in the following references:

- i. Screenshots of www.peapod.com retrieved via the Wayback Machine, www.archive.org, and dated 11/13/1996 (referred to herein as reference A);
- ii. Article by Walsh entitled "Survey-Mastering Information Management" from Financial Times, dated 03/15/1999 (referred to herein as reference B).

As per claim 10, Peapod.com teaches a method comprising:

delivering a service to a person at a postal address (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 6, and page 10, wherein delivery is provided to at least one client based on the client's postal information), the method including the steps of:

creating storage for cross-referencing said postal address to a geographic location for each person of a plurality persons (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 5, section 2, page 6,

Art Unit: 3623

and reference B, page 2, section 1, wherein the postal address (i.e. zip location) of the client is cross-referenced to a service area (geographic location) and is stored by the website/software);

creating a database for storing details pertaining said service applicable to said to be delivered at said postal address (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 5, section 1, and page 10, and reference B, page 2, section 1, wherein information is obtained related to the delivery service wanted by at least one client, the information stored in the system);

providing said service to said person based on said cross-referenced location and on said selected information retrieved from said second database (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 6, and page 10, wherein delivery is provided to at least one client based on the client's postal information).

However, Peapod.com does not expressly disclose that the person is a handicapped person, a first and a second database, or that the geographic location is terrestrial coordinates.

Fitch et al. discloses precise terrestrial coordinates corresponding to a postal address (See column 6, lines 15-35, column 12, lines 50-65).

However, Fitch et al. does not expressly disclose that the person is a handicapped person or a first and a second database.

Behnke discloses first and second storage units (See column 5, lines 55-65, column 7, lines 5-20, column 9, lines 25-40, wherein each terminal and central system has separate data storage) and handicapped persons needing door-to-door services (See column 1, lines 30-45).

All of Fitch et al., Behnke, and Peapod.com disclose location based service, as well as the use of data storage and databases. Peapod.com discloses providing a person home delivery service on items such as those from the grocery or drugstore. Fitch et al. discloses correlating

Art Unit: 3623

coordinate information and street addresses to provide services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide delivery service based on terrestrial coordinates in order to more efficiently provide services to a person's home by precisely identifying the location. See reference A, page 2, section 3, and page 3, section 1, and column 6, lines 15-35, column 12, lines 50-65, of Fitch et al., both emphasizing the speed of delivery of service. Peapod.com also discusses the ease of having deliveries come to the home in reference A, page 2, sections 2-3, page 5, section 1.

Peapod.com discloses providing a person home delivery service on items such as those from the grocery or drugstore. Behneke discloses the need of handicapped persons for door-to-door service. Examiner points out that the use of the method with regards to handicapped persons is an intended field of use, since the fact that the client is handicapped has no bearing on the functionality of the claim. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide delivery service to a person with a handicap in order to more efficiently meet the needs of handicapped users in a timely and efficient manner. See column 1, lines 5-11 and 30-40, of Behneke and reference A, page 2, section 3, and page 3, section 1, both emphasizing the speed of delivery of service. Peapod.com also discusses the ease of having deliveries come to the home in reference A, page 2, sections 2-3, page 5, section 1.

Furthermore, Peapod.com discloses database and storage associated with the website and software as well as geographical locations associated with postal information. Behnke discloses that terminal and central system have separate data storage, storing different information, as well as terrestrial coordinates associated with the postal location of a customer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the data

Art Unit: 3623

storage and database of Peapod.com using two separate databases in order to increase the access efficiency in retrieving data by decreasing time based on the use of multiple databases.

Examiner points out that the use of a single database of two databases storing the claimed data has no functional significance in the claim limitations.

As per claim 11, Peapod.com teaches wherein said service includes providing a rapid and timely delivery of medication to said person (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 4, section 1, page 6, and page 10, wherein delivery is provided to at least one client within windows of 90 or 30 minutes, wherein a delivery includes a delivery from a drugstore (i.e. medications)).

However, neither Peapod.com nor Fitch et al. expressly discloses that the person is handicapped or that the drugs delivered are based on renewal dates.

Behnke discloses requested service delivery wherein handicapped persons require door-to-door services, thus since the handicapped person requires door-to-door service, the handicapped person is immobile without the service (See column 1, lines 5-14 and 30-45). However, Behnke does not discuss medications with renewal dates.

Both Behnke and Peapod.com disclose home service based on information input into an interface at the person's home location. Peapod.com discloses providing a person home delivery service on items such as those from the grocery or drugstore. Behneke discloses the need of handicapped persons for door-to-door service. It is well known in the art that home delivery services are necessary for some users, such as users with severe handicaps. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide delivery service to a person with a handicap in order to more efficiently meet the needs of handicapped users in a timely and efficient manner. See column 1, lines 5-11 and 30-40, of

Art Unit: 3623

Behneke and reference A, page 2, section 3, and page 3, section 1, both emphasizing the speed of delivery of service. Peapod.com also discusses the ease of having deliveries come to the home in reference A, page 2, sections 2-3, page 5, section 1.

Further, reordering medication on renewal dates known to a system (be that of a doctor, a pharmacy (i.e. drug store), or a patient) is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place drug delivery orders in Peapod.com using renewal dates in order to more accurately ensure that a patient is being administered drugs at the proper time (i.e. does not miss a date, does not overlap, etc.).

As per claim 12, Peapod.com discloses a person initiating a call to confirm an order and the delivery being sent as soon as confirmed by said person (See page 2, section 1, page 4, and page 7, wherein the person calls the service and the delivery is sent upon confirmation).

However, neither Peapod.com nor Fitch et al. expressly disclose that the person is handicapped.

Behnke discloses requested service delivery wherein handicapped persons require door-to-door services, thus since the handicapped person requires door-to-door service, the handicapped person is immobile without the service (See column 1, lines 5-14 and 30-45).

Both Behnke and Peapod.com disclose home service based on information input into an interface at the person's home location. The use of the method with regards to handicapped persons is an intended field of use, since the fact that the client is handicapped has no bearing on the functionality of the claim. It is well known in the art that home delivery services are necessary for some users, such as users with severe handicaps. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide delivery service

Art Unit: 3623

to a person with a handicap in order to more efficiently meet the needs of handicapped users in a timely and efficient manner. See column 1, lines 5-11 and 30-40, of Behneke and reference A, page 2, section 3, and page 3, section 1, both emphasizing the speed of delivery of service.

As per claim 13, Peapod.com teaches wherein said service is selected from the group that includes determining a preferred delivery mode required by said person (See reference A, page 2, section 3, page 3, section 1, page 5, section 1, wherein delivery preferences are specified). However, neither Peapod.com nor Fitch et al. expressly disclose that the person is handicapped.

Behnke discloses requested service delivery wherein handicapped persons require door-to-door services, thus since the handicapped person requires door-to-door service, the handicapped person is immobile without the service (See column 1, lines 5-14 and 30-45).

Both Behnke and Peapod.com disclose home service based on information input into an interface at the person's home location. The use of the method with regards to handicapped persons is an intended field of use, since the fact that the client is handicapped has no bearing on the functionality of the claim. Peapod.com discloses providing a person home delivery service on items such as those from the grocery or drugstore. Behneke discloses the need of handicapped persons for door-to-door service. It is well known in the art that home delivery services are necessary for some users, such as users with severe handicaps. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide delivery service to a person with a handicap in order to more efficiently meet the needs of handicapped users in a timely and efficient manner. See column 1, lines 5-11 and 30-40, of Behneke and reference A, page 2, section 3, and page 3, section 1, both emphasizing the speed of

Art Unit: 3623

delivery of service. Peapod.com also discusses the ease of having deliveries come to the home in reference A, page 2, sections 2-3, page 5, section 1.

Claims 25 is substantially similar to claim 13 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kennedy (U.S. 6,369,705) teaches correlating a unique address with GPS coordinates to provide service.

Wiese (U.S. 6,323,885) discloses determining a precise map location using address information.

Morimoto et al. (U.S. 5,544,061) discloses a coordinate list that correlates telephone numbers, addresses, names, and places to absolute coordinates (such as longitude and latitude).

Nowak et al. (U.S. 6,757,545) discloses providing service to a location, such as 911 service, by correlating addresses to coordinates.

Bullock et al. (U.S. 6,810,323) discloses determining the street address by cross-referencing the coordinates of the geographic position with locations on pre-existing maps stored at the remote server

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (571) 272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

Art Unit: 3623

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

lwd
bvd

June 1, 2006


Beth Van Doren
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3623